

And finally, Syria has had the chance to rein in Hezbollah. I have personally asked senior Syrian government officials to disarm Hezbollah, arguing that Syria's interests are best served through peace negotiations. These requests have been consistently rejected. Syria continues to provide strategic, financial, and logistical support to Hezbollah in a misguided effort to keep the Lebanese conflict with Israel burning.

These issues are not imagined and they are not part of some secret Israeli agenda, as the Syrians believe. They are real problems that have driven a wedge between our two nations. I don't know if this bill will succeed in changing Syria's behavior—sanctions are rarely an effective long-term solution. But we cannot ignore the fact that Syria and the United States are moving in two very different directions. Diplomacy with Syria has failed. Syria has been given a choice and it has chosen poorly.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Oct. 14, 2003]

OPINION/EDITORIAL

(By Darrell Issa)

During a recent visit to Damascus, Syrian President Bashar al-Assad told me "we want to be part of this world—we do not want to be isolated like North Korea." This statement demonstrated that the young Syrian president understands that Syria is heading down a path toward complete isolation.

Unfortunately, President Assad also appears to believe that he can postpone isolation indefinitely by straddling two very different paths. One is the path of cooperation. The Bush administration has noted that, following the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks, Syria provided us with valuable intelligence on al Qaeda that ultimately saved American lives. President Assad opened up his office to visiting American officials—something his father, the late Hafez Assad—was reluctant to do. He has talked about Syria becoming a member of the World Trade Organization and expressed interest in visiting the United States.

But Bashar Assad has also perpetuated Syrian policies that keep it on the State Department's list of state sponsors of terrorism. He has failed to fully shut down Palestinian terrorist offices that operate out of Damascus. During Operation Iraqi Freedom, he failed to stop the flow of jihadis and military equipment across the border that killed American soldiers.

The most troubling concern for America, however, is Syria's intention to support Hezbollah, an Iranian-backed terrorist organization that continues to fight a proxy war with Israel and provide assistance to other terrorist groups like Palestinian Islamic Jihad.

Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage has referred to Hezbollah as the "A-team of terrorism." Hezbollah operatives are responsible for the murder of more than 250 American peacekeepers and diplomats in Beirut in the 1980s. They are suspected in carrying out two bombings in Argentina that killed over 100 civilians. Imad Mughniyah, the suspected mastermind of numerous terrorist attacks against Americans, is a senior adviser in Hezbollah's organizational structure. There is evidence that Hezbollah operatives have infiltrated Iraq to join attacks against American soldiers. As senior Bush administration officials have stated repeatedly, Bashar Assad has a choice to make: Either cooperate and be rewarded or continue to support terrorism and risk total isolation.

Assad's strategy of trying to keep one foot on each path will not work much longer. He may be faced with isolation sooner than he

thinks. The Syria Accountability Act, which could mandate isolation at the levels of Libya or Iran, is now poised to move quickly through Congress. Until recently, the Bush administration opposed the act, arguing that it is the president's constitutional responsibility to determine the nature of diplomatic relations with foreign countries. But as Syria consistently showed no sign of changing its dangerous policies, the White House changed its mind and has now given the act the green light.

The result for Syria will be devastating. Libya has learned the costs of total isolation as a result of supporting global terrorism. Only after a decade of international rejection has Libya begun to dig its way out of isolation. Bashar Assad has but a few days left to change direction: to put both feet on the path of cooperation and lead Syria into the community of nations.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 1828 as a part of my hope and commitment to finding a just, permanent, democratic, prompt, non-military conclusion to our occupation of Iraq and as part of my hope and commitment to doggedly pursue a roadmap to peace, security and justice for both the people of Israel and the people of Palestine.

There is no magic bullet, no simple solution to bringing an end to terrorism. What we do know is we cannot win alone, that we must find the means to enlist every nation as an ally. Our record, to date, in this regard can only be characterized as poor.

The President has reported that the territory of Syria has been, and is being, used as a base by certain terrorist organizations.

This bill gives the President additional diplomatic and economic leverage in the war on terror. Our goal is to deny sanctuary to terrorist who may be using the territory of Syria.

Our aim is to become partners with Syria in the war on terror, not to make Syria an enemy, not to punish the Syrian people.

We trust that these new options will offer constructive new possibilities and potential to American diplomacy and that these new powers will be used wisely and constructively.

Mr. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1828, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, October 14, 2003, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for a period of debate on the subject of

a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for defense and the reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004.

□ 1758

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for a period of debate on the subject of a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for defense and the reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, with Mr. LATOURETTE in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), or their designees, each will control 2½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. YOUNG of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, before we get started, let me announce for the membership that we expect to begin the 5 hours of debate agreed to under the unanimous consent agreement on the fiscal year 2004 Supplemental Appropriations Act at this time, and we will continue through roughly 6:30 or 6:45 this evening. At that time, the committee will rise and the previous votes that were postponed will be called.

After the votes, we will continue with the general debate through ten o'clock this evening. At that time, the committee will rise.

Tomorrow morning, we will resume debate with any remaining time allocated under the unanimous consent agreement. Tomorrow there will also be one hour of debate on the rule and one additional hour of general debate on the supplemental before beginning the amendment process.

□ 1800

I am hopeful that with the assistance of our colleagues that we will be able to enter into a unanimous consent agreement to limit debate and amendments so that the House will have a full opportunity to dispose of the supplemental before adjourning on Friday.

Mr. Chairman, last week, the Committee on Appropriations ordered this legislation reported by a vote of 47 to 14. The bill recommended by the committee provides total discretionary supplemental appropriations of \$86.9 billion for reconstruction activities in both Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as funding for our military presence in both countries. We have had hearings and briefings to better understand the President's request. We have scrubbed the request, and we have made some

improvements. I would say that a report of our subcommittees, who visited Iraq, were thoroughly vetted and we received really good information. We believe that the bill that we have written and provided to the House is a good bill.

The bill prioritizes funding for urgent needs for security, for power, drinking water, health care, and infrastructure. Included is \$64.8 billion for our national defense, for our troops in the field, for those who are at risk in the battle. That is \$64.8 billion for their needs, \$18.6 billion for Iraq relief and reconstruction, and \$1.2 billion for Afghanistan relief and reconstruction.

I want to make the point, Mr. Chairman, that when I say reconstruction, I am not talking about building something back that the United States destroyed. We are talking about helping the people of Iraq build an infrastructure that Saddam Hussein for several decades allowed to deteriorate to the point that many, many Iraqis did not have sanitary conditions, did not have electrical power, did not have things that normal people would expect to have for quality of life.

We have made a few changes to the President's request in our bill that we present today. I think we should highlight what those differences are, because I think most everyone has had an opportunity to read about the President's request. With regard to Iraq relief and reconstruction, there have been a number of questions about the Coalition Provisional Authority, or CPA, which is run by Ambassador Bremer. The CPA is in charge of the largest foreign assistance program since the Marshall Plan after World War II. Whether health care, electric power, water treatment, or democracy building, all of these activities are under the supervision of the Coalition Provisional Authority. These are not military items; they are civil issues and foreign assistance issues relating to the reconstruction of Iraq.

The bill provides a direct appropriation of \$858 million to the CPA for their operating expenses; and that is instead of providing these funds in the U.S. Army Operation and Maintenance accounts, as had been requested. The amount of money does not change; it is just the location in the bill. And we believe that by doing it this way, that we have far better accountability for how this money will be spent. This gives us considerable transparency.

Our bill provides transfer authority of up to 1 percent of the funds, roughly \$186 million, provided in the Iraq relief and reconstruction fund, for unanticipated expenses of the CPA. Again, this does not add anything to the bill; it just gives the CPA some flexibility in how they use some of the funds that are appropriated. We have not changed at all the reporting relationships of Ambassador Bremer to the President of the United States through the Secretary of Defense. We have prohibited funding to be administered by any offi-

cial who is not answerable to Congress, and we believe that that strengthens our responsibilities under the Constitution to have accountability for appropriated funds.

The bill includes a prohibition on the use of any funds in this act to be used to pay Iraq's foreign debts. I know that was a concern of a lot of Members, and rightfully so. Let me repeat that. The bill includes a prohibition on the use of any U.S. funds in this act to be used to pay Iraq's foreign debts. All of the funds provided here are in direct grants. There is no loan authority provided.

A provision is also included to limit the use of noncompetitive contracts in the reconstruction and relief funds for Iraq. The provision preserves the prerogative of the President to waive the requirement for full and open competition in certain circumstances, but these circumstances are as presently outlined in applicable Federal procurement regulations. So the committee has made a strong statement that these contracts should be competitively bid. The provision requires the executive branch to provide notice and justification to Congress if and when the waiver authority is exercised.

Let me take a couple of minutes to say a few things that we did not fund.

We did not fund \$50 million requested for buildings, equipment, and vehicles in support of Iraq's traffic police.

We did not include \$300 million for the construction of two additional prisons at \$50,000 per bed. We did provide \$100 million for one prison.

We did not approve \$153 million for improving solid waste management programs, including the procurement of 40 trash trucks at \$50,000 each.

We did not include \$4 million for a nation-wide numbering scheme, or \$9 million for postal information architecture and ZIP codes, or \$10 million to modernize the business practices of the Iraqi television and radio industry.

We did not agree to the \$100 million to build seven new housing communities.

We did not agree to the \$150 million to initiate a new \$500 million to \$700 million children's hospital in Basra. However, we channeled those funds to modernize current medical facilities in Iraq. We have funded \$793 million for local and regional health clinics and hospital equipment throughout Iraq. And our rationale was that it would be far better to have the medical care facilities closer at hand for all Iraqi citizens rather than building one hospital that Iraqis from all over the country would have to find a way to get to if they needed the medical care of that hospital. So we think this is a wiser way to fund this.

We did not include the \$200 million requested to create an American-Iraqi enterprise fund.

Now, with regard to Afghanistan relief and reconstruction, we included \$375 million above the President's request with the intent of showing tan-

gible improvement in the security and quality of life of most Afghans by summer of 2004. Included are funds above the request for schools and education, private sector development, and electrical power generation to assist the central government of Afghanistan, including elections and improved governance.

The mark also includes \$245 million for peacekeeping in Liberia. This was not requested by the President. The Liberia deployment came later; but it was a necessary expense.

We have included the bulk of the President's request for national defense. There are some differences from the request, and they would include the following:

Our bill increases funds to purchase body armor, special armor plate inserts, for those who are on the battlefield. And we are tremendously disturbed that there are soldiers in Afghanistan and Iraq today without adequate body armor. That is just not acceptable. We have provided funding in the past in an earlier supplemental to buy this body armor. We are disturbed that it has not been distributed yet to the soldiers in the field and we make a strong statement in this bill on that issue.

We also increase funds for the clearing of unexploded ordnance, which is causing damage to a lot of our troops, and improved communications and replacement equipment. This equipment is being worn out as the deployment proceeds.

The mark also provides funding for the contracting of civilian security guards to replace Reservists and Guardsmen currently performing these duties at Army installations. The Army has indicated this provision would permit the demobilization of 7,000 to 10,000 Reserve component soldiers. Some of our National Guard and Reserves have actually spent more time in Iraq than some of the active duty forces.

In addition, the mark includes \$563 million not requested by the administration for recovery and repairs to military facilities damaged by Hurricane Isabel.

Mr. Chairman, as I have said before in this Chamber, and I think this debate has pointed out, there are political and philosophical differences in this institution and in our country. That is why we have two parties. But there is a practical reality to the bill that is before the House today. This is not a partisan bill. No one on either side of the political spectrum has attempted to make it a partisan bill here in the House of Representatives. The reality is simple: we have 140,000 men and women of our military in Iraq and Afghanistan today. Whether you agree with that or not, we have to make sure they have the tools, equipment, and resources necessary to carry out their mission in as safe and secure a manner as possible. The bill provides funds for that purpose.

I want our troops home at the earliest possible time. We all want our troops home at the earliest possible time. That is not going to happen until some stability has been established in these countries. If we simply pull out now, all of their efforts and their losses would have been in vain, for naught. The bill provides money for that purpose. That is the reality of the situation we are in now. There is no turning back. We can debate at length the decisions that were made, but we must do the right thing and support the men and women who are carrying out our mission.

Some have questioned whether there was an imminent threat in Iraq. As I see it, there was a cumulative threat that was building for years with a tyrant who we know turned poison gas on his own people on at least two occasions. We know that a significant foreign policy goal of the United States, peace in the Middle East, will never be achieved with this cumulative threat looming over the region. It was past time for Saddam to go.

As for Afghanistan, unfortunately the imminent threat of al Qaeda training camps and terrorist activities became a reality readily apparent after the attacks of September 11. These ter-

rorist threats, left undisrupted, became cumulative actions against our country. We witnessed this on February 26, 1993, when terrorists bombed the World Trade Center; and on June 25, 1996, when Khobar Towers, the home of American airmen, was bombed, killing 19 American airmen; then on August 7, 1998, when our embassies in Kenya and Tanzania were bombed; and then on October 12, 2000, when the USS *Cole*, the United States destroyer, was bombed, with the loss of 17 sailors and injuries to many others.

I would say the threat was imminent when these attacks occurred; but we responded with harsh words and a few cruise missiles, but not much more. Our actions in Iraq and Afghanistan not only address and respond to the threats and actions we have witnessed to date, but they will move us one step closer to achieving the goal of stability in this region. The funding in this bill supports that goal, supports our military, and will bring us one step closer to bringing our troops home.

Mr. Chairman, we will hear, I am sure today, that we are spending money that we do not have and that the bill should be paid for. And that would be really nice. I am one of those who believes that you pay as you go

and you do not go into deficit. But we are dealing with an unusual situation; and what I say, Mr. Chairman, is that we are investing in the future of our children and our grandchildren. We are investing in future generations: investing to provide security for those future generations free from the fear of threat, free from the threat of terrorist attacks, and free from having airlines hijacked and flown into buildings housing Americans.

□ 1815

We are making an investment, Mr. Chairman, in the security of our future, in the security of future generations, to do everything possible that we can to rid the world of the terrorist threat that has taken so many innocent lives in these items that I have just referred to. And so all in all, while I think that there will be some controversy, I believe the debate will be a very good, high-level debate. I am hopeful we can finish it within a couple of days. I am satisfied that when the roll is called that there will be a very substantial vote for this bill for the protection of our troops and for the ability to bring them home once they have stabilized the region and can do so safely.

FY 2004 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEFENSE AND FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION
OF IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN (H.R. 3289)
BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

(Amounts in thousands)			
	FY 2004 Request	Recommended in the Bill	Bill vs. Request

TITLE I - NATIONAL SECURITY			
CHAPTER 1			
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE			
Military Personnel			
Military Personnel, Army (emergency).....	12,858,870	12,188,870	-670,000
Military Personnel, Navy (emergency).....	816,100	816,100	---
Military Personnel, Marine Corps (emergency).....	753,190	753,190	---
Military Personnel, Air Force (emergency).....	3,384,700	3,384,700	---
Total, Military Personnel.....	17,812,860	17,142,860	-670,000
Operation and Maintenance			
Operation and Maintenance, Army (emergency).....	24,190,464	24,355,664	+165,200
Operation and Maintenance, Navy (emergency).....	2,106,258	1,934,058	-172,200
(Transfer out) (emergency).....	(-80,000)	(-80,000)	---
Coast Guard Operations (by transfer) (emergency).....	(80,000)	(80,000)	---
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (emergency)...	1,198,981	1,198,981	---
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (emergency).....	5,948,368	5,598,368	-350,000
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide (emergency)...	4,618,452	4,485,452	-133,000
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve (emergency).....	16,000	16,000	---
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve (emergency).....	53,000	53,000	---
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard (emergency).....	214,000	214,000	---
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid (emergency).....	35,500	35,500	---
Iraq Freedom Fund (emergency).....	1,988,600	1,988,600	---
Total, Operation and Maintenance.....	40,369,623	39,879,623	-490,000
Procurement			
Missile Procurement, Army (emergency).....	6,200	---	-6,200
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army (emergency).....	46,000	101,600	+55,600
Other Procurement, Army (emergency).....	930,687	1,250,287	+319,600
Aircraft Procurement, Navy (emergency).....	128,600	158,600	+30,000
Other Procurement, Navy (emergency).....	76,357	76,357	---
Procurement, Marine Corps (emergency).....	123,397	123,397	---
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (emergency).....	40,972	53,972	+13,000
Missile Procurement, Air Force (emergency).....	20,450	20,450	---
Other Procurement, Air Force (emergency).....	3,441,006	3,418,006	-23,000
Procurement, Defense-Wide (emergency).....	435,635	418,635	-17,000
Total, Procurement.....	5,249,304	5,621,304	+372,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation			
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy (emergency).....	34,000	34,000	---
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force (emergency).....	39,070	39,070	---
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide (emergency).....	265,817	195,817	-70,000
Total, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation.....	338,887	268,887	-70,000

FY 2004 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEFENSE AND FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION
OF IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN (H.R. 3289)
BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

(Amounts in thousands)			
	FY 2004 Request	Recommended in the Bill	Bill vs. Request

Revolving and Management Funds			
Defense Working Capital Funds (emergency).....	600,000	600,000	---
National Defense Sealift Fund (emergency).....	24,000	24,000	---
Total, Revolving and Management Funds.....	624,000	624,000	---
Other Department of Defense Programs			
Defense Health Program (emergency).....	658,380	658,380	---
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense (emergency).....	73,000	73,000	---
Total, Other Department of Defense Programs....	731,380	731,380	---
Related Agencies			
Intelligence Community Management Account (emergency).....	21,500	21,500	---
Transfer to Department of Energy.....	(3,000)	(3,000)	---
Transfer to Department of Justice.....	(15,500)	(15,500)	---
GENERAL PROVISIONS			
Transfer Authority (sec. 1101) (emergency).....	(5,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(-2,000,000)
Storm Damage (sec. 1109) (emergency).....	---	413,300	+413,300
Total, Chapter 1.....	65,147,554	64,702,854	-444,700
	=====	=====	=====
CHAPTER 2			
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY			
United States Coast Guard			
Operating expenses (emergency).....	---	23,183	+23,183
	=====	=====	=====
CHAPTER 3			
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION			
Military construction, Army (emergency).....	119,900	185,100	+65,200
Military construction, Air Force (emergency).....	292,550	292,550	---
Military construction, Navy (emergency).....	---	45,530	+45,530
Family housing operations and maintenance, Army (emergency).....	---	8,151	+8,151
Family housing operation and maintenance, Navy and Marine Corps (emergency).....	---	6,280	+6,280
Family housing operation and maintenance, Air Force (emergency).....	---	6,981	+6,981
Total, Chapter 3.....	412,450	544,592	+132,142
	=====	=====	=====
Total, TITLE I.....	65,560,004	65,270,629	-289,375
	=====	=====	=====
TITLE II - IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN RECONSTRUCTION			
AND INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE			
CHAPTER 1			
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE			
General Legal Activities (emergency).....	---	15,000	+15,000

FY 2004 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEFENSE AND FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION
OF IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN (H.R. 3289)
BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Request	Recommended in the Bill	Bill vs. Request
<hr/>			
DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND RELATED AGENCY			
Administration of Foreign Affairs			
Diplomatic and Consular programs (emergency).....	40,500	156,300	+115,800
Reappropriation.....	35,800	---	-35,800
Rescission (emergency).....	---	-35,800	-35,800
Embassy Security, Construction and Maintenance (emergency).....	60,500	43,900	-16,600
Emergencies in the Diplomatic and Consular service (emergency).....	50,000	50,000	---
Total, Administration of Foreign Affairs.....	186,800	214,400	+27,600
International Organizations			
Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities (emergency).....	---	245,000	+245,000
RELATED AGENCY			
Broadcasting Board of Governors			
International Broadcasting Operations (emergency).....	---	40,000	+40,000
Total, Chapter 1.....	186,800	514,400	+327,600
Emergency appropriations.....	(186,800)	(550,200)	(+363,400)
Emergency rescissions.....	---	(-35,800)	(-35,800)
	=====	=====	=====
CHAPTER 2			
BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE			
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT			
United States Agency for International Development			
Operating expenses of the United States Agency for International Development (emergency).....	40,000	40,000	---
OTHER BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE			
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT			
Iraq relief and reconstruction fund (emergency).....	20,304,000	18,649,000	-1,655,000
Operating Expenses of the Coalition Provisional Authority (emergency).....	---	858,000	+858,000
Economic support fund (emergency).....	422,000	872,000	+450,000
International disaster and famine assistance (emergency).....	---	100,000	+100,000
United States Emergency Fund for Complex Foreign Crises (emergency).....	100,000	---	-100,000
DEPARTMENT OF STATE			
International narcotics control and law enforcement (emergency).....	120,000	170,000	+50,000
Nonproliferation, antiterrorism, demining and related programs (emergency).....	35,000	35,000	---

FY 2004 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEFENSE AND FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION
OF IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN (H.R. 3289)
BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Request	Recommended in the Bill	Bill vs. Request
<hr/>			
MILITARY ASSISTANCE			
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT			
Foreign Military Financing Program (emergency).....	222,000	297,000	+75,000
Peacekeeping operations (emergency).....	50,000	50,000	---
	-----	-----	-----
Total, Chapter 2.....	21,293,000	21,071,000	-222,000
	=====	=====	=====
 Total, TITLE II.....	 21,479,800	 21,585,400	 +105,600
Emergency appropriations.....	(21,479,800)	(21,621,200)	(+141,400)
Emergency rescissions.....	---	(-35,800)	(-35,800)
	=====	=====	=====
 GRAND TOTAL (net).....	 87,039,804	 86,856,029	 -183,775
Emergency appropriations.....	(87,039,804)	(86,891,829)	(-147,975)
Emergency rescissions.....	---	(-35,800)	(-35,800)
Transfer authority (emergency).....	(5,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(-2,000,000)
(Transfer out) (emergency).....	(-77,000)	(-77,000)	---
(By transfer) (emergency).....	(95,500)	(95,500)	---
	=====	=====	=====

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 11 minutes. This is not a debate about 9/11. After 9/11, Chairman YOUNG and I pushed through the House a \$40 billion appropriation to respond to the events that led to that sneak attack. Chairman YOUNG and I then led an effort to add billions of dollars to Homeland Security to protect our ports, secure air transportation and equip our local first responders, our firemen, our policemen to deal with a whole range of terrorist threats. We worked to add more than \$2 billion in Homeland Security funds, even though the President threatened to veto those additional expenditures. Even the President of the United States has admitted publicly that there is no evidence that Iraq had anything to do with that sneak attack. So let us make that clear.

Secondly, let us also make clear that this should not be a debate about whether we should have attacked Iraq. Before the vote on that question, I asked a whole range of questions to try to determine whether the administration had real expectations and a real plan for dealing with the aftermath of the war. I wanted Saddam removed, but I wanted al Qaeda and Osama bin Laden removed even more. In the end, I voted to require the President to come back to Congress for another vote before attacking Iraq if he could not get the agreement of the United Nations so that we could take one last look at the evidence, one last look at the administration's planning for the aftermath before we pulled the trigger. But Congress gave the green light to attack unilaterally. The result, Saddam is gone, that is good, but now it appears that the administration sold the Congress on supporting a go-it-alone strategy, except for a British puppy, through the selective manipulation of intelligence.

This Congress was asked to do a rush job in providing \$60 billion plus for the cost of going to war. We were asked to provide maximum flexibility in the use of that money, and Congress did. And now we find, with that maximum flexibility, that 40,000 troops were not supplied by the Pentagon with the correct body armor, American soldiers were killed and maimed by remotely detonated bombs because an insufficient number of electric jammers was supplied by the Pentagon, and there were days during the war when the troops only got one meal a day because of insufficient MREs.

We are now isolated from our allies, and we have been left holding the bag financially, militarily, and politically for occupying and reconstructing the country. We are told we do not have enough soldiers on the ground to even protect ammunition dumps from looting and theft. We are told that the military is stretched to the breaking point, creating opportunities for more mischief from countries like Iran and North Korea.

But that is all yesterday's argument. The time to think all of those things through was before we attacked, because once you are involved in a war, you are stuck with it for a while, and certainly you are stuck with the aftermath, as we are now. So at this point, I recognize the need and the obligation to support a reconstruction package. I agree that both reconstruction and additional military funding are needed to fix the situation. And I recognize that we cannot simply withdraw from something that we started, even though I was not in on the takeoff. But that does not mean that Congress must support any slap-dash request from the administration that is thrown on the table. The Founding Fathers gave us one overreaching power to affect major issues, the power of the purse. If we do not use that power constructively to make sure that actions of the executive branch are well-focused and well-thought-out, we are AWOL from our duty.

The fact is we still do not have a detailed accounting of how the dollars we previously appropriated for this action have been used. We still have no meaningful idea of what cost the administration expects to incur over the next 5 years, even though they surely have expectations about that and prepare 5-year plans for everything else under God's creation. We have yet to receive a realistic description of how our allies can be brought on board to help provide troops and funds to spread around the burden of reconstruction. We have no real idea about how the administration expects to deal with the over-extension of our military and the disruption of troop rotation requirements because of that overextension. And we certainly do not know how we are going to pay for it, except to get out our kids' credit card and say, "Charge it."

There is no question in the aftermath of this administration and this Congress' decision to invade Iraq that we have now incurred certain obligations to the Iraqi people, but we have also obligations to our own people. That is why the important question here today is not whether this committee funding proposition, or an alternative, is better. The amendment that I will offer does not solve most of the dilemmas that I described or answer most of the questions that I have raised because only the administration has the power to do that. All the amendment that I will offer at some point says is: if you are going to spend \$87 billion, then there is a better way to do it, a way which will be more effective on the ground and less damaging to our taxpayers.

The issue is not whether the administration's package should be cut or not because, frankly, I think the administration is still hiding from Congress its long-term expectations on the full cost of this war. But this Congress has an obligation to know what the whole picture is and what the whole bill will be

before we write the check. And we have an obligation to know how it is going to be paid for. That is what the amendment that we will offer will try to do. That is all we can expect it to do at this point.

Let me take just a moment or two to describe what we will try to do with that amendment. We will try to reduce the committee package for reconstruction so that the total number for reconstruction is \$14 billion rather than the \$20 billion asked for by the administration. We will use that money in a number of ways. First of all, we would do it to provide a quality-of-life initiative for our troops. The first thing we would do under that heading is to recognize the fact that almost 80 percent of our troops today are in situations where they are forced to drink putrid water because the administration asked for sufficient funding only to deal with the water problems at one of the nine bases where American troops are stationed. So we provide the money to try to correct that problem for the rest of the troops.

Secondly, we would provide some of that money to provide predeployment health and dental screening for the Guard and Reserve forces who have to go into regular service so that they do not have to bear that cost themselves.

Thirdly, we extend postdeployment health coverage, (that is health coverage) for people who served and are now returning to their communities. We would extend that from the present 60 days to 6 months. And we would expand prepaid phone card services so it is easier for those troops to call home. And cover more R&R transportation costs.

We would also try to recognize what General Shinseki warned us about when he warned us not to follow a 12-division strategy if we only had a 10-division Army. And so what we will do is face up to, squarely and promptly, the need to increase the size of the Army by at least 20,000 people if we are going to be in a position to defend this country against other security problems that may develop anywhere from North Korea to Iran. And, secondly, we will try, by doing that, to relieve the pressure on the Guard and Reserve forces who have been forced to take up greater burdens than they expected when they first joined up.

Then we will provide additional funding to refurbish the equipment that has been used up in the Iraqi war. We know what the services indicated they needed in this fiscal year. The problem is the Pentagon civilian leadership did not ask for that full amount. We provide the full amount that the services asked for so that we do not have huge amounts of military equipment, tanks and Bradleys and other expensive equipment simply sitting in unusable condition because we have not sufficiently refurbished it.

Let me now turn to what we do with the \$14 billion remaining in the redevelopment account. What we attempt

to do with that is to provide \$7 billion of that, half of it roughly, a little less than \$7 billion, in cash money, as the administration requested, so that they have enough money to deal with their immediate cash flow problems. Then we take the other six plus billion dollars and we put it in a special account in the World Bank to be matched on a two-to-one basis by foreign contributors. That is a way, in our view, that you can do two things. You can help to internationalize the question of who is going to pay for the long-term redevelopment costs of Iraq and at the same time we can protect the American taxpayer from the cronyism in the awarding of contracts that is bound to be there if those contracts are let by an agency that is responsive to the political appointees in the White House.

And then lastly and most importantly, in my view, we pay for it. What we simply say is that we should provide for a return to preexisting law of the levels of taxation for the very top bracket in this society, that top 1 percent that makes over \$330,000 a year. What that would mean is that someone making \$1 million, instead of getting a \$130,000 tax cut, would get a tax cut of about \$52,000. That would still be more than 10 times as much as taxpayers who are in the \$200,000 to \$500,000 bracket, and it would be considerably more than that if you compare what they get to the small tax cut of about \$1,000 to people in the 50 to \$75,000 bracket. So I would suggest that anyone who thinks that we are penalizing the top 1 percent, I would simply say that is certainly not the case. We are simply limiting the size of their tax cut to the size that will be provided to the next wealthiest Americans in the country. I daresay I think most of the people in that top 1 percent would say that if that is what is necessary to pay our bills rather than sending them on to our grandkids, they would be more than willing to participate.

Mr. Chairman, that is what we intend to try to accomplish as this debate moves forward.

Let me take one other moment to simply congratulate the chairman of the committee, because there is no question about it, he has made significant improvements in the administration proposal. Both parties wanted to eliminate some of the "quaint" items, to put it politely, that were inserted which would be red flags to any hard-working taxpayer in this country. And I appreciate the fact that we were able to work together to eliminate those provisions. But I think we have a long way to go to get the answers that we need from the administration in order to justify providing another \$90 billion in taxpayers' money.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3289 and

I will be voting, however it comes out in final form, for this very much needed legislation and commend our President and commend, of course, Chairman YOUNG for the great job he has done on this.

□ 1830

I firmly support the \$66 billion appropriated in this bill which covers our military costs in Iraq. It is vitally important that we pass this. That is why I will support the bill no matter how it comes out at the end.

However, I will be opposing the \$18.6 billion of reconstruction money in the bill as it is being presented to us today. Helping Iraq rebuild is certainly an important part of our winning in Iraq, but they should be based on loans, rather than based on gifts from the American people. Instead, we are being told today that this \$18.6 billion reconstruction package must be in the form not of a loan that will be repaid to us when Iraq gets back on its feet but instead as a giveaway, as a grant.

The American people are already carrying a heavy burden for peace in the region and the Federal level of deficit spending is almost \$400 billion. And Iraq someday very shortly is going to be one of the wealthiest countries of the world, if not the wealthiest, because they produce more oil and will be producing more oil than just about anybody. So we should be asking for a payback for this \$18 billion.

But why are we being told it has to be a grant instead of a loan? Because Iraq supposedly already owes \$120 billion to foreign banks. Give me a break. What is being said here? We have got to spend \$20 billion in a grant form, a giveaway, to protect the loans, the billions of dollars of loans that German and French banks gave to Saddam Hussein? That makes no sense. I will be offering an amendment to make sure to secure wording which will suggest that this reconstruction package of \$18.6 billion is in the form of a loan, not a gift.

If this is ruled not germane or out of order, I will immediately offer another amendment which will strike \$18.6 billion from the bill, and specifically reconstruction funds, which means a vote "yes" on the Rohrabacher amendment is a vote for the loans because if my amendment passes, the administration will quickly come back with providing this \$18.6 billion reconstruction program in the form of a loan, rather than as a giveaway and a gift to the people of Iraq.

So I would ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3289 and voting for it in final passage no matter what happens to my amendment, but I would suggest that they support the Rohrabacher amendment which will guarantee that the reconstruction funds in this bill be paid back after a while when Iraq gets back on its feet. The American people carry too heavy a burden. Let us give them a break.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gen-

tleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), the ranking member of the Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, let me talk about a couple of different things. We have all talked about the shortages. I think we have taken care of most of the shortages. I am a little concerned about the jammers, although General Myers said he personally took an interest in them; but the inserts for the body armor, the tracks, and I have talked to the companies, I wanted to make sure that they were going all out. A couple of companies said 90 percent of their production was going to be getting this equipment out to the troops, and finally we are getting to the people in the field who are making the decisions rather than the bureaucrats.

But one of the things that worries me now is I have got a letter in my pocket from a young person, and here is what the young sergeant says: he said he is in the 307th MP Company. He has been on active duty since the summer of 2001: "We have served proudly in peacekeeping in Bosnia, stateside on homeland defense, and finally as warfighters in Iraq, and I think we have done our job." This young man is in the 307th MP in the National Guard, and he wants to come home. He has been on active duty 2 out of 6 years that he has been in the National Guard. And one of the things I have talked about over the years is we cannot sustain these deployments. We need either more active-duty troops or we need to find a way to have foreign troops, Coalition forces, to replace our troops.

I know that I am starting to get letters from people saying that the Reserve and Guard are having such a difficult time sustaining themselves in the period of time that they are overseas, and I agree with that. I understand that. I met a couple of Reservists not long ago who had been in Bosnia; and one of their friends had been killed accidentally with a 50 caliber, and they were talking about how often they have been called up during this period of time. We can say they volunteered, but this is not the normal procedure. When we talk about a low-intensity war, we are talking about the type of war we are in now.

I have always said when somebody asks me how much money does the million military need, I have said it depends on the tempo of operations, and our tempo of operations and throughout the world where we have got 48 percent of the Army deployed, we have got 25 to 30 percent of the Guard and/or Reserve deployed, and what we have to look at is how do we replace these people. The other day the budget director of the Army said to a group at the AUS dinner, he said we are running out of gas. What he means is he does not have troops to replace the ones that are overseas. Some of the equipment needs to be reconstituted. We need to find a way to support this.

I am for the \$87 billion. I think that is absolutely essential. There is no question in my mind that the reconstruction money is just as important as the military security money. I feel very strongly about that. If we want security, we have got to put people back to work. We have got between 50 and 60 percent unemployment. We have got all kinds of electricity problems. We have got water problems and everything else. And in order to provide a secure atmosphere, in order to get our people home, we have to reconstruct or spend money on reconstruction in Iraq itself.

I know that every time I go to the field, I get troops that complain; but that is the normal thing that we see with troops. But on the other hand, we have got Reserve and Guards that have been deployed for such a long period of time. And the employers are starting to write to me saying I cannot keep these guys on any longer, small business people. Very few of them get paid the difference. We have got bankers and people who are in the Reserve and Guard, and those folks are not getting any kind of extra pay. So we have got some real problems here in sustaining this force.

Hopefully, we will be able to get people from the Coalition force to replace our forces. Hopefully, in the near future we will have our people with all the equipment they need. We will get the security situation under control. We will Iraqitize. We will internationalize, and we will energize this operation.

So I fully support the presentation by the President. I feel very strongly about it. But on the other hand, we have got an awful lot of work to do before we get our troops home.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN) having assumed the chair, Mr. LATOURETTE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under debate the subject of a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for defense and the reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, had come to no resolution thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The Speaker pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on the motions to instruct postponed on Wednesday, October 8, and on one motion to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Motion to instruct on H.R. 6, by the yeas and nays;

Motion to instruct on H.R. 1308, by the yeas and nays;

Motion to instruct on H.R. 1, by the yeas and nays;

And H.R. 1828, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining votes in this series will be 5-minute votes.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 6, ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on the motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 6.

The Clerk will designate the motion.

The Clerk designated the motion.

The Speaker pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct conferees offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 182, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 540]

YEAS—229

Abercrombie	Eshoo	Lofgren
Ackerman	Etheridge	Lowey
Allen	Evans	Lynch
Andrews	Farr	Majette
Baca	Fattah	Maloney
Baird	Feeney	Markey
Baldwin	Ferguson	Matheson
Ballance	Filner	Matsui
Becerra	Foley	McCarthy (MO)
Berkley	Ford	McCarthy (NY)
Berman	Frank (MA)	McCollum
Berry	Frelinghuysen	McDermott
Bilirakis	Frost	McGovern
Bishop (NY)	Gallegly	McIntyre
Blumenauer	Gilchrest	McNulty
Boehlert	Gillmor	Meehan
Boswell	Gordon	Meek (FL)
Boucher	Goss	Meeks (NY)
Boyd	Green (WI)	Menendez
Bradley (NH)	Grijalva	Michaud
Brady (PA)	Gutierrez	Millender-
Brown (OH)	Harman	McDonald
Brown, Corrine	Harris	Miller (FL)
Brown-Waite,	Hastings (FL)	Miller (NC)
Ginny	Hill	Miller, George
Burr	Hinchev	Moore
Capito	Hoeffel	Moran (VA)
Capps	Holden	Murtha
Capuano	Holt	Nadler
Cardin	Honda	Napolitano
Cardoza	Hooley (OR)	Oberstar
Carson (IN)	Hoyer	Obey
Case	Inslee	Olver
Castle	Israel	Owens
Chabot	Jackson (IL)	Pallone
Clyburn	Jackson-Lee	Pascarell
Conyers	(TX)	Pastor
Cooper	Janklow	Payne
Costello	Jefferson	Pelosi
Cox	Johnson (CT)	Peterson (MN)
Crenshaw	Johnson (IL)	Petri
Crowley	Johnson, E. B.	Platts
Cummings	Jones (NC)	Pombo
Cunningham	Kanjorski	Portman
Davis (AL)	Kaptur	Price (NC)
Davis (CA)	Keller	Putnam
Davis (FL)	Kelly	Quinn
Davis (IL)	Kennedy (MN)	Rahall
Davis (TN)	Kennedy (RI)	Ramstad
DeFazio	Kildee	Rangel
DeGette	Kilpatrick	Ros-Lehtinen
Delahunt	Kind	Rothman
DeLauro	Kleczka	Roybal-Allard
Deutsch	LaHood	Royce
Diaz-Balart, L.	Langevin	Ruppersberger
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lantos	Rush
Dicks	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)
Dingell	Larson (CT)	Sabo
Doggett	Leach	Sanchez, Linda
Doyle	Lee	T.
	Levin	Sanchez, Loretta
	Lewis (GA)	Sanders
	Lipinski	Schakowsky
	LoBiondo	Schiff

Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Simmons
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark

Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Walsh

Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NAYS—182

Aderholt	Goode	Ose
Akin	Goodlatte	Otter
Alexander	Granger	Oxley
Bachus	Graves	Paul
Baker	Green (TX)	Pearce
Ballenger	Greenwood	Pence
Barrett (SC)	Gutknecht	Peterson (PA)
Bartlett (MD)	Hall	Pickering
Barton (TX)	Hart	Pitts
Bass	Hastings (WA)	Pomeroy
Beauprez	Hayes	Porter
Bell	Hefley	Pryce (OH)
Bereuter	Hensarling	Regula
Biggert	Herger	Rehberg
Bishop (GA)	Hinojosa	Renzi
Bishop (UT)	Hobson	Reyes
Blackburn	Hoekstra	Reynolds
Blunt	Hostettler	Rodriguez
Boehner	Houghton	Rogers (AL)
Bonilla	Hulshof	Rogers (KY)
Bonner	Hunter	Rogers (MI)
Boozman	Hyde	Rohrabacher
Brady (TX)	Isakson	Ross
Brown (SC)	Issa	Ryan (WI)
Burgess	Istook	Ryun (KS)
Burns	Jenkins	Sandlin
Burton (IN)	John	Schrock
Buyer	Johnson, Sam	Sensenbrenner
Camp	King (IA)	Sessions
Cannon	King (NY)	Shadegg
Cantor	Kingston	Sherwood
Carson (OK)	Kirk	Shimkus
Carter	Knollenberg	Shuster
Chocola	Kolbe	Simpson
Coble	Lampson	Skelton
Cole	Latham	Smith (MI)
Collins	LaTourette	Smith (TX)
Cramer	Lewis (CA)	Stenholm
Crane	Lewis (KY)	Sullivan
Cubin	Linder	Tancred
Culberson	Lucas (KY)	Tanner
Davis, Jo Ann	Lucas (OK)	Tauzin
Deal (GA)	Manzullo	Taylor (MS)
DeLay	McCotter	Taylor (NC)
DeMint	McCrery	Terry
Dooley (CA)	McInnis	Thomas
Doolittle	McKeon	Thornberry
Dreier	Mica	Tiahrt
Duncan	Miller (MI)	Tiberi
Edwards	Miller, Gary	Toomey
Emerson	Moran (KS)	Visclosky
English	Murphy	Vitter
Everett	Musgrave	Walden (OR)
Flake	Myrick	Wamp
Forbes	Neugebauer	Whitfield
Franks (AZ)	Ney	Wicker
Garrett (NJ)	Northup	Wilson (NM)
Gerlach	Norwood	Wilson (SC)
Gibbons	Nussle	Wolf
Gingrey	Ortiz	Young (AK)
Gonzalez	Osborne	

NOT VOTING—23

Bono	Jones (OH)	Nunes
Calvert	Kline	Radanovich
Clay	Kucinich	Saxton
Davis, Tom	Marshall	Souder
Fletcher	McHugh	Sweeney
Fossella	Mollohan	Turner (OH)
Gephardt	Neal (MA)	Turner (TX)
Hayworth	Nethercutt	

□ 1902

Mr. REGULA and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. PETRI, FRELINGHUYSEN, BECERRA, GORDON, and PORTMAN, and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."